

## **REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner enter the foregoing claim amendments.

### ***Section 102 Rejections***

#### **Boulter Reference**

Claims 20-25, 27, and 31 were rejected under Section 102(b) as being anticipated by Boulter (US Patent No. 6,093,312). Claim 20 has been amended and recites first and second user access areas, and "wherein said first and second user access areas are not presented as a combined user access area". This amendment addresses the Examiner's concern about the terms "remote" and "integral", and makes clear that, unlike Boulter, the claimed invention provides user interfaces that are not at the same location for combined uses. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 20, and all its dependent claims, should be allowed over the Boulter reference.

Furthermore, Claim 31 has been amended to recite that the cooling proximity of the reservoir and cooling source is to "allow conductive cooling of said reservoir". This feature is nowhere found or suggested in Boulter. The Examiner's rejection based on Figure 32 of Boulter is inapposite, as it only shows reclaiming of harvest overflow water, not conductive cooling, as claimed, and as was intended by the "cooling proximity" language of the claim. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 31 is in condition for allowance.

### ***Section 103 Rejections***

#### **Boulter + Voznick**

Claims 1, 4, 8, 10, and 12-14 were rejected under Section 103 as being unpatentable over Boulter in view of Voznick. Claim 1 has been amended to recite "a cooling source, said reservoir located in cooling proximity to said cooling source so as to

allow conductive cooling of said reservoir". Nowhere is this concept of conductive cooling presented in cited art, and, as discussed above, the Examiner's rejection of Claim 4, based on Figure 32 of Boulter, is inapposite, as it only shows reclaiming of harvest overflow water, not conductive cooling. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are in condition for allowance.

**Boulter + Credle References**

Claims 26 and 28-30 were rejected under Section 103 as being obvious over Boulter in view of Credle. Applicant maintains the arguments previously made with respect to these claims, and respectfully traverses the rejection. Furthermore, the amendment to Claim 20, from which these claims depend, makes clear that, unlike Boulter or Credle, even if combined, the claimed invention provides user interfaces that are not at the same location for combined uses.

**Boulter + Voznick + Credle References and  
Boulter + Voznick + Credle + Blades References**


Claims 15 and 17-19 were rejected based on the combination of Boulter, Voznick, and Credle references, and Claims 6, 7, 11, and 12 were rejected based on the combination of Boulter, Voznick, and Blades references. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections based on previous arguments, and based on the amendments to Claim 1 from which all of these claims depend.

---

Applicant respectfully requests allowance of all outstanding claims. If there are any questions concerning this amendment, please call Dennis Braswell at the telephone number set forth below.

**Please direct all correspondence to:**  
**Dennis Braswell**  
**105 Soost Court**  
**Mobile, Alabama 36608**  
**Telephone (251) 414-2969.**

9/16/03  
Date

  
Dennis Braswell  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 35,831